arXiv:1701.03901v1 [math.NT] 14 Jan 2017

# Systems of cubic forms in many variables

S. L. Rydin Myerson

January 17, 2017

**Abstract**

We consider a system of $R$ cubic forms in $n$ variables, with integer coefficients, which define a smooth complete intersection in projective space. Provided $n \geq 25R$, we prove an asymptotic formula for the number of integer points in an expanding box at which these forms simultaneously vanish. In particular we can handle systems of forms in $O(R)$ variables, previous work having required that $n \gg R^2$. One conjectures that $n \geq 6R + 1$ should be sufficient. We reduce the problem to an upper bound for the number of solutions to a certain auxiliary inequality. To prove this bound we adapt a method of Davenport.

## Contents

**1 Introduction** **2**
1.1 Main result . . . . . 2
1.2 Related work . . . . . 3
1.3 Reduction to an auxiliary inequality . . . . . 3
1.4 Outline of remaining steps . . . . . 5
1.5 Structure of this paper . . . . . 6
1.6 Notation . . . . . 6

**2 The eigenvalues of the Hessian matrix $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$** **6**

**3 Intermission: Eigenvalues and minors** **9**

**4 Counting points in the sets $K_k(E_1, \dots, E_{k+1})$** **11**

**5 Small values of a trilinear form** **16**

**6 Constructing singular points on $V(c)$** **20**

**7 Acknowledgements** **21**

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Main result

Let $c_1(\boldsymbol{x}), \dots, c_R(\boldsymbol{x})$ be homogeneous cubic forms in $n$ variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$, with integer coefficients. We treat the simultaneous Diophantine equations

$$c_1(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0, \quad \dots, \quad c_R(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$$

and the corresponding projective variety in $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}_{\mathbb{Q}}$, which we call $V(c_1, \dots, c_R)$. We assume throughout that the $c_i$ generate the ideal of $V(c_1, \dots, c_R)$, and are linearly independent. The cubic case of a classic result of Birch gives us:

**Theorem 1.1** (Birch [2])**.** *Let $\mathscr{B}$ be a box in $\mathbb{R}^n$, contained in the box $[-1,1]^R$, and having sides of length at most 1 which are parallel to the co-ordinate axes. For each $P \geq 1$, write*

$$N_{c_1,\dots,c_R}(P) = \#\{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \boldsymbol{x}/P \in \mathscr{B},\, c_1(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0, \dots, c_R(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0\}.$$

*If the variety $V(c_1, \dots, c_R)$ is a smooth complete intersection, and we have*

$$n \geq 8R^2 + 9R, \tag{1.1}$$

*then for some $\mathfrak{I}$, $\mathfrak{S} \geq 0$ and all $P \geq 1$, the bound*

$$N_{c_1,\dots,c_R}(P) = \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{S}P^{n-3R} + O(P^{n-3R-\delta}) \tag{1.2}$$

*holds, where the implicit constant depends only on the forms $c_i$, and $\delta$ is a positive real number depending only on $d$ and $R$. If the variety $V(c_1, \dots, c_R)$ has a smooth point over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ for each prime $p$, and a real point whose homogeneous co-ordinates lie in $\mathscr{B}$, then $\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{I}$ are positive.*

In particular this follows from Theorem 1 of Birch [2], on inserting the bound $\dim V^* \leq R - 1$ for the dimension of the variety $V^*$ occurring in that result. This bound follows from Lemma 3.1 of Browning and Heath-Brown [4] whenever $V(c_1, \dots, c_R)$ is a smooth complete intersection. See [17, Lemma 1.1] for details.

We sharpen (1.1) as soon as $R \geq 3$. In §1.3 we prove:

**Theorem 1.2.** *In Theorem 1.1 we may replace* (1.1) *with the condition*

$$n \geq 25R. \tag{1.3}$$

For example when $R = 3$ and $V(c_1, c_2, c_3)$ is a smooth complete intersection, Theorem 1.2 applies when $n \geq 75$, whereas Birch's theorem requires $n \geq 99$.

The "square-root cancellation" heuristic suggests that in place of (1.1) the condition $n \geq 6R + 1$ should suffice, see for example the discussion around formula (1.5) in Browning [3]. By handling systems of forms in $O(R)$ variables we come within a constant factor of this conjecture.

Our strategy is an extension of our previous work [17]. In forthcoming papers we further generalise this approach to treat systems of $R$ forms with degree $d \geq 2$, with rational or real coefficients.

## 1.2 Related work

We begin with the case when the forms $c_i(\boldsymbol{x})$ are diagonal.

In the case of a single diagonal form $c$, Baker [1] proves that $V(c)$ has a rational point whenever $n \geq 7$.

Brüdern and Wooley [8, 7, 11] treat diagonal systems in $n \geq 6R+1$ variables. This is the best value of $n$ possible with the classical circle method. In particular they prove the Hasse principle for $V(c_1, \ldots, c_R)$ whenever the $c_i$ are diagonal, $V(c_1, \ldots, c_R)$ is smooth and $n \geq 6R+1$. They also prove an asymptotic formula of the type (1.2) whenever $n \geq 6R+3$ holds, or when $R = 2$ and $n \geq 14$ holds [5, 6, 9]. In the case $R = 2$ they prove a Hasse principle for certain pairs of diagonal cubics in as few as 11 variables [10].

Returning to the case of general (not necessarily diagonal) forms, we consider the case $R = 1$. Let $c$ be a cubic form. Hooley [16] proves that if $n = 8$, the variety $V(F)$ is smooth, and the box $\mathscr{B}$ does not contain a point at which the Hessian determinant of $F$ vanishes, then the asymptotic formula (1.2) holds. In this work he assumes a Riemann hypothesis for a certain modified Hasse-Weil $L$-function. When $n = 9$ he proves the same result unconditionally, the weaker error term $o(P^{n-3})$ in place of the $O(P^{n-3-\delta})$ from (1.2). Heath-Brown [15] proves that if $n \geq 14$ then $V(c)$ always has a rational point, regardless of whether it is singular.

In the case $R = 2$, Dietmann and Wooley [14] have shown that $V(c_1, c_2)$ always has a rational point when $n \geq 827$, whether or not it is smooth.

In the general case $R \geq 1$, Schmidt [18] shows that $V(c_1, \ldots, c_R)$ always has a rational point if $n \geq (10R)^5$. Recent work of Dietmann [13] improves this condition to $n \geq 400\ 000R^4$.

## 1.3 Reduction to an auxiliary inequality

To prove Theorem 1.2 we will use Theorem 1.3 from the author's previous work [17]. This will reduce the problem to proving an upper bound for the number of solutions to the following *auxiliary inequality*.

**Definition 1.1.** For any $k \geq 1$ and $\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, we write $\|\boldsymbol{t}\|_\infty = \max_i |t_i|$ for the supremum norm. When $c(\boldsymbol{x})$ is a real cubic form in $n$ variables with real coefficients, we define a symmetric matrix

$$H_c(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{\|c\|_\infty} \left( \frac{\partial^3 c(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right)_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \tag{1.4}$$

where $\|c\|_\infty = \frac{1}{6} \max_{i,j,k \in \{1,\ldots,n\}} \left| \frac{\partial^3 c(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial x_i x_j x_k} \right|$. Thus $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$ is the Hessian of the cubic form $c(\boldsymbol{x})/\|c\|_\infty$, which has been normalised so that 1 is the absolute value of its largest coefficient. For each $B \geq 1$ we put $N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)$ for the number of pairs of vectors $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2$ with

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_\infty, \|\boldsymbol{y}\|_\infty \leq B, \qquad \|H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{y}\|_\infty < B.$$

We show that this definition of $N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)$ above agrees with the one given in [17, Definition 1.1]. There we consider a degree $d$ polynomial $f$ and a system of multilinear forms $\boldsymbol{m}^{(f)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}^{(d-1)})$, and when $d = 3$ and $f(\boldsymbol{x}) = c(\boldsymbol{x})$, we see that

$$\boldsymbol{m}^{(f)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{x}^{(2)}) = \|c\|_\infty H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)})\boldsymbol{x}^{(2)}.$$

It follows that the definition above agrees with Definition 1.1 from [17]. The case $d = 3$ of Theorem 1.3 in [17] therefore states that:

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let the counting function $N_{c_1,\dots,c_R}(P)$ be as in Theorem 1.1. Suppose that for some $C_0 \geq 1$ and $\mathscr{C} > 3R$, we have*

$$N^{\mathrm{aux}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{c}}(B) \leq C_0 B^{2n-8\mathscr{C}} \tag{1.5}$$

*for all $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^R$ and $B \geq 1$, where we write $\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{c}$ for $\beta_1 c_1 + \cdots + \beta_R c_R$. Then for some $\mathfrak{I}$, $\mathfrak{S} \geq 0$ we have*

$$N_{c_1,\dots,c_R}(P) = \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{S}P^{n-dR} + O(P^{n-dR-\delta})$$

*for all $P \geq 1$, where the implicit constant depends at most on $C_0$, $\mathscr{C}$ and the $c_i$, and the positive constant $\delta$ depends at most on $\mathscr{C}$, $d$ and $R$. The constants $\mathfrak{I}$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ are positive under the same conditions as in Theorem 1.1.*

We give the following bound for the counting function $N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)$. The proof occupies the bulk of this paper and is completed in §6.

**Proposition 1.1.** *We call a set $\mathcal{K}$ of real cubic forms in $n$ variables a* closed cone *if (i) for all $c \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\lambda \geq 0$ we have $\lambda c \in K$, and (ii) $\mathcal{K}$ is closed in the real linear space of cubic forms in $n$ variables.*

*Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a closed cone as above, and let $N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)$ be as in Definition 1.1. If we set*

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{K}} = 1 + \max_{c\in\mathcal{K}\setminus\{0\}} \dim \mathrm{Sing}\, V(c), \tag{1.6}$$

*so that $\sigma_{\mathcal{K}} \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, then for all $\epsilon > 0$, $c \in \mathcal{K}$ and $B \geq 1$ we have*

$$N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B) \ll_{\mathcal{K},\epsilon} B^{n+\sigma_{\mathcal{K}}+\epsilon}. \tag{1.7}$$

We will outline the proof after deducing Theorem 1.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Suppose that (1.3) holds. We claim that for all $B \geq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^R$ we have

$$N^{\mathrm{aux}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{c}}(B) \ll_{c_1,\dots,c_R,\epsilon} B^{n+R-1+\epsilon} \tag{1.8}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{c}$ is as in Theorem 1.3. If we set $\mathscr{C} = (n - R + \frac{1}{2})/8$ and let $C_0$ be sufficiently large in terms of the forms $c_i$, we can then apply Theorem 1.3. For (1.8) implies (1.5) on setting $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ in (1.8). Moreover we have $\mathscr{C} > 3R$,

by (1.3). So the hypotheses of Theorem 1.3 are satisfied, and Theorem 1.2 follows.

Setting $\mathcal{K} = \{\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{c} : \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^R\}$ in Proposition 1.1, we see that (1.8) follows from (1.7) unless $\sigma_{\mathcal{K}} > R-1$ holds. Suppose for a contradiction that we have $\sigma_{\mathcal{K}} > R-1$.

By the definition (1.6) there must be $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^R \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ with

$$\dim \operatorname{Sing} V(\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{c}) \geq R-1. \tag{1.9}$$

We may assume that $V(c_1,\dots,c_R) = V(c_1,\dots,c_{R-1},\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{c})$ holds, after permuting the $c_i$ if necessary. Since $V(c_1,\dots,c_R)$ is a smooth complete intersection, we then have

$$V(c_1,\dots,c_{R-1}) \cap \operatorname{Sing} V(\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{c}) \subset \operatorname{Sing} V(c_1,\dots,c_R),$$

and so $\dim \operatorname{Sing} V(c_1,\dots,c_R) > \dim \operatorname{Sing} V(\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{c}) - R$ holds. Thus (1.9) implies that $V(c_1,\dots,c_R)$ is singular, which is false by assumption. □

## 1.4 Outline of remaining steps

To prove Proposition 1.1 we adapt the argument used to prove Lemma 3 in Davenport [12], and subsequently a somewhat more general result in §5 of Schmidt [18]. These authors consider the counting function defined by

$$N_c^{\text{aux-eq}}(B) = \#\{(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2 : \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_\infty, \|\boldsymbol{y}\|_\infty \leq B,\, H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{y} = \mathbf{0}\}$$

for some cubic form $c$ with integer coefficients. Davenport proves that either $N_c^{\text{aux-eq}}(B)$ is small, or there is a large rational linear space on which $c$ vanishes. In order to briefly sketch his line of reasoning, we define some additional notation.

**Definition 1.2.** Let $\|H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\|_\infty = \max_{i,j}|H_c(\boldsymbol{x})_{ij}|$ and let $\lambda_{c,1}(\boldsymbol{x}),\dots,\lambda_{c,n}(\boldsymbol{x})$ be the eigenvalues of the real symmetric matrix $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$, listed with multiplicity and in order of decreasing absolute value. Observe that

$$|\lambda_{c,1}(\boldsymbol{x})| \leq n\|H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\|_\infty \leq n^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_\infty. \tag{1.10}$$

For each $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$ let $\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,i)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ be the vector of all $i\times i$ minors of $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$, arranged in some order. This is a vector of degree $i$ homogeneous forms in the variables $\boldsymbol{x}$, with real coefficients. Let $J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,i)}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ be the Jacobian matrix $(\partial\Delta_j^{(c,i)}(\boldsymbol{x})/\partial x_k)_{jk}$.

Davenport's argument runs as follows.

(1) Let $\sigma \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}$. Suppose that $N_c^{\text{aux-eq}}(B) \gg B^{n+\sigma}$ for some sufficiently large implicit constant. The contribution to this count from any one vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ is at most $O(B^{n-\operatorname{rank} H_c(\boldsymbol{x})})$. So there must be an integer $b$ in the set $\{0,\dots,n-1\}$ such that at least $\gg B^{\sigma+b}$ integer points $\boldsymbol{x}$ satisfy both $\operatorname{rank} H_c(\boldsymbol{x}) = b$ and $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_\infty \leq B$.

(2) If $\sigma, b$ are as in (1), then it follows that there is an integer point $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}$ such that $\operatorname{rank} H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}) = b$ holds and the tangent space to the affine variety $\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{0}$ at the point $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}$ has dimension $\sigma + b + 1$ or more. Equivalently, $\operatorname{rank} H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}) = b$ and $\operatorname{rank} J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}) \leq n - \sigma - b - 1$ both hold. This follows from Lemma 2 of Davenport [12].

(3) If there exists a vector $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}$ as in (2), then it follows that there exist linear subspaces $X, Y$ of $\mathbb{Q}^n$, with dimensions $\sigma + b + 1$ and $n - b$ respectively, such that for all $\boldsymbol{X} \in X$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{Y'} \in Y$ the equality $\boldsymbol{Y}^T H_c(\boldsymbol{X}) \boldsymbol{Y'} = 0$ holds. See Lemma 4 in Schmidt [18] or the proof of Lemma 3 in Davenport [12].

(4) We conclude that if $N_c^{\text{aux-eq}}(B) \gg B^{n+\sigma}$ then there are spaces $X, Y$ as in (3). So the space $Z$ defined by $Z = X \cap Y$ is a rational linear space, with dimension at least $\sigma + 1$, such that for all $\boldsymbol{Z} \in Z$ the equality $c(\boldsymbol{Z}) = 0$ holds.

Our setting differs in three ways from that of Schmidt and Davenport. First, we consider the inequality $\|H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{y}\|_\infty \leq B$ rather than the equation $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{0}$. Second, for us the cubic form $c(\boldsymbol{x})$ may have real coefficients. And third, rather than concluding that $c(\boldsymbol{x})$ has a rational linear space of zeroes, we seek to show that the variety $V(c)$ is very singular.

### 1.5 Structure of this paper

In §2 and the three sections §§4-6 we will modify each of the four steps (1)-(4) above to accommodate the three changes described at the end of §1.4. In the remaining section, §3, we prove some technical lemmas relating the minors and eigenvalues of real matrices.

### 1.6 Notation

Throughout, we let $c$, $\|\boldsymbol{t}\|_\infty$, $\|c\|_\infty$, $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $N_c^{\text{aux}}(B)$ be as in Definition 1.1, and we let $\|H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\|_\infty$, $\lambda_{c,i}(\boldsymbol{x})$, $\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,i)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,i)}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ be as in Definition 1.2. We do not require algebraic varieties to be irreducible, and we adopt the convention that $\dim \emptyset = -1$. We use Vinogradov's $\ll$ notation and big-$O$ notation in the usual way.

## 2 The eigenvalues of the Hessian matrix $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$

We show that if the counting function $N_c^{\text{aux}}(B)$ from Definition 1.1 is large, then there are many integer points $\boldsymbol{x}$ for which the eigenvalues of $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$ lie in some fixed dyadic ranges. This corresponds to step (1) from §1.4.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let $H$ be a real symmetric $n \times n$ matrix and let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of the matrix $H$, listed with multiplicity and in order of decreasing absolute value. Let $C \geq 1$ and $B \geq 1$, and suppose that $|\lambda_1| \leq CB$ holds. Set*

$$N_H(B) = \#\{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \|\boldsymbol{y}\|_\infty \leq B,\, \|H\boldsymbol{y}\|_\infty \leq B\}.$$

*Then we have*

$$N_H(B) \ll_{C,n} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{B^n}{1 + |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_i|}.$$

*Proof.* The integral vectors $\boldsymbol{y}$ counted by $N_H(B)$ are all contained in the box $\|\boldsymbol{y}\|_\infty \leq B$, and in the ellipsoid

$$\{\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \boldsymbol{t}^T H^T H \boldsymbol{t} \leq nB^2\},$$

which has principal radii $|\lambda_i|^{-1}\sqrt{n}B$. Hence

$$N_H(B) \ll_n \prod_{i=1}^{n} \min\{1 + |\lambda_i|^{-1}\sqrt{n}B,\, B\}$$

and as $|\lambda_i| \leq CB$ holds, this is

$$\leq \prod_{i=1}^{n} \min\{2C|\lambda_i|^{-1}\sqrt{n}B,\, B\}.$$

It follows that

$$N_H(B) \ll_{C,n} B^n \prod_{i=1}^{n} \min\{|\lambda_i|^{-1},\, 1\}.$$

Since the inequalities $|\lambda_1| \geq \cdots \geq |\lambda_n|$ hold, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} N_H(B) &\ll_{C,n} B^n \min\left\{1,\, \frac{1}{|\lambda_1|},\, \frac{1}{|\lambda_1\lambda_2|},\, \dots,\, \frac{1}{|\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n|}\right\} \\ &\ll \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{B^n}{1 + |\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_i|}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Definition 2.1.** Suppose that $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ and that $E_1, \dots, E_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the inequalities $E_1 \geq \cdots \geq E_{k+1} \geq 1$ hold. Then we define $K_k(E_1, \dots, E_{k+1})$ to be the set of all vectors $\boldsymbol{x}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying the following conditions: the inequality $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_\infty \leq B$ holds, and we have

$$\frac{1}{2}E_i < |\lambda_{c,i}(\boldsymbol{x})| \leq E_i$$

whenever $1 \leq i \leq k$ holds, and we have

$$|\lambda_{c,i}(\boldsymbol{x})| \leq E_{k+1}$$

whenever $k + 1 \leq i \leq n$ holds.

**Corollary 2.1.** *Let $N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)$ be as in Definition 1.1, let $\lambda_{c,i}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,i)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ be as in Definition 1.2, and let $K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$ be as in Definition 2.1. For any $B \geq 1$, one of the following alternatives holds. Either*

$$\frac{N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)}{B^n(\log B)^n} \ll_n \#\{\mathbb{Z}^n \cap K_0(1)\}, \tag{2.1}$$

*or there is $k \in \{1,\dots,n-1\}$ and there are $e_1,\dots,e_k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the inequalities $\log B \gg_n e_1 \geq \cdots \geq e_k$ hold and*

$$\frac{2^{e_1+\cdots+e_k} N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)}{B^n(\log B)^n} \ll_n \#\big\{\mathbb{Z}^n \cap K_k(2^{e_1},\dots,2^{e_k},1)\big\}, \tag{2.2}$$

*or there are $e_1,\dots,e_n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $\log B \gg_n e_1 \geq \cdots \geq e_n$ and*

$$\frac{2^{e_1+\cdots+e_n} N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)}{B^n(\log B)^n} \ll_n \#\big\{\mathbb{Z}^n \cap K_{n-1}(2^{e_1},\dots,2^{e_n})\big\}. \tag{2.3}$$

*Proof.* Note that in the case that $k = n$, there are no values of $i$ satisfying $k+1 \leq i \leq n$, so the last condition in the definition of $K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$ is vacuously true and can be omitted. In particular, if $k = n$ then (2.3) follows from (2.2), because

$$K_n(2^{e_1},\dots,2^{e_n},1) \subset K_{n-1}(2^{e_1},\dots,2^{e_n}).$$

So it is enough to prove that either (2.1) holds or there exist integers $k$ and $e_1,\dots,e_k$, satisfying the inequalities $1 \leq k \leq n$ and $\log B \gg_n e_1 \geq \cdots \geq e_n$, such that (2.2) holds.

Now the set $K_0(1)$, together with the sets $K_k(2^{e_1},\dots,2^{e_k},1)$, partition the box $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_\infty \leq B$ into disjoint pieces. So, if we let

$$N_{H_c(\boldsymbol{x})}(B) = \#\{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \|\boldsymbol{y}\|_\infty \leq B,\ \|N_{H_c(\boldsymbol{x})}(B)\boldsymbol{y}\|_\infty \leq B\},$$

then we have

$$N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B) = \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n \\ \boldsymbol{x}\in K_0(1)}} N_{H_c(\boldsymbol{x})}(B) + \sum_{\substack{1\leq k\leq n \\ e_1\geq\cdots\geq e_k\geq 1 \\ e_1\ll_n \log B}} \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n \\ \boldsymbol{x}\in K_k(2^{e_1},\dots,2^{e_k},1)}} N_{H_c(\boldsymbol{x})}(B). \tag{2.4}$$

The total number of terms on the right-hand side of (2.4) is $O_n((\log B)^n)$ at most, so it follows that either

$$\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n \\ \boldsymbol{x}\in K_0(1)}} N_{H_c(\boldsymbol{x})}(B) \gg_n \frac{N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)}{(\log B)^n} \tag{2.5}$$

holds, or else there are $1 \leq k \leq n$ and $e_1 \geq \cdots \geq e_k \geq 1$ such that

$$\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n \\ \boldsymbol{x}\in K_k(2^{e_1},\dots,2^{e_k},1)}} N_{H_c(\boldsymbol{x})}(B) \gg_n \frac{N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)}{(\log B)^n}. \tag{2.6}$$

If (2.5) holds then the trivial bound $N_{H_c(\boldsymbol{x})}(B) \ll_n B^n$ implies (2.1). Suppose instead that (2.6) holds.

By (1.10), for each real vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ the bound $|\lambda_{c,1}(\boldsymbol{x})| \ll_n B$ holds. So we may apply Lemma 2.1 with the choice $H = H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$ and some $C$ depending on $n$ only. This shows that

$$N_{H_c(\boldsymbol{x})}(B) \ll_n \frac{B^n}{2^{e_1+\cdots+e_k}}.$$

Substituting this into (2.6) we see that (2.2) holds, as claimed. □

# 3 Intermission: Eigenvalues and minors

Here we collect some elementary facts about the eigenvalues and minors of real matrices which will be needed in §§4-5.

**Lemma 3.1.** *For each $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$, let*

$$T_{k,\ell} = \{\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{N}^k : 1 \le a_1 < \cdots < a_k \le \ell\}.$$

*This set has $\binom{\ell}{k}$ members. For each $k, \ell, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \le \min\{\ell, m\}$, and each $\ell \times m$ real matrix $L$, define an $\binom{\ell}{k} \times \binom{m}{k}$ real matrix $L^{[k]}$ by*

$$L^{[k]} = (L^{[k]}_{\boldsymbol{ab}})_{\boldsymbol{a}\in T_{k,\ell}, \boldsymbol{b}\in T_{k,m}}, \qquad L^{[k]}_{\boldsymbol{ab}} = \det((L_{a_i b_j})_{1\le i,j\le k}),$$

*so that the $L^{[k]}_{\boldsymbol{ab}}$ are the $k \times k$ minors of $L$. For all $\ell \times m$ matrices $L$, all $m \times n$ matrices $M$ and all $k \le \min\{\ell, m, n\}$ we have $(LM)^{[k]} = L^{[k]}M^{[k]}$. That is, we have*

$$(LM)^{[k]}_{\boldsymbol{ab}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{w}\in T_{k,m}} L^{[k]}_{\boldsymbol{aw}} M^{[k]}_{\boldsymbol{wb}}. \tag{3.1}$$

*Proof.* Let $\boldsymbol{e}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{e}^{(m)}$ be the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^m$. Fix $L, \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}$; then each side of (3.1) is an alternating multilinear form in those $k$ columns of $M$ whose indices appear in the vector $\boldsymbol{b}$. This is some $k$-tuple of $m$-vectors.

If one is given the value of an alternating multilinear form at the $k$-tuple $\boldsymbol{e}^{(z_1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{e}^{(z_k)}$ for each $\boldsymbol{z} \in T_{k,m}$, one can extend by linearity and the alternating property to find its value at any $k$-tuple of $m$-vectors. In other words, it suffices to check (3.1) when, for some $\boldsymbol{z} \in T_{k,m}$, the $k\times k$ submatrix $(M_{z_i b_j})_{1\le i,j\le k}$ is the identity and all other entries of $M$ are zero. In this case both sides of (3.1) are equal to $M^{[k]}_{\boldsymbol{zb}}$. □

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let $M$ be a real $m \times n$ matrix. Recall that $M^TM$ is positive semidefinite and symmetric. Let the eigenvalues of $M^TM$ be $\Lambda_1^2, \cdots, \Lambda_n^2$ in decreasing order, where the $\Lambda_i$ are nonnegative and in decreasing order. That is, the $\Lambda_i$ are the* singular values *of $M$, listed in decreasing order.*

*In particular, if $M$ is a symmetric matrix, then the $\Lambda_i$ are exactly the absolute values of the eigenvalues of $M$, by diagonalisation.*

*Given a natural number $k$ with $k \le \min(m,n)$, let $\boldsymbol{D}^{(k)}$ be the vector of $k \times k$ minors of $M$, arranged in some order. Then we have:*

*(i) The maximum norm $\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(k)}\|_\infty$ satisfies*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(k)}\|_\infty \asymp_{m,n} \Lambda_1 \cdots \Lambda_k. \tag{3.2}$$

*(ii) There is a $k$-dimensional linear space $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that for all $\boldsymbol{v} \in V$,*

$$\|M\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \gg_{m,n} \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \Lambda_k. \tag{3.3}$$

*We may take $V$ to be a span of $k$ standard basis vectors $\boldsymbol{e}^{(i)}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

*(iii) For any $C \ge 1$, either there is an $(n-k+1)$-dimensional linear subspace $X$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$\|M\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty \le C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{X} \in X, \tag{3.4}$$

*or there is a $k$-dimensional linear subspace $V$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$, spanned by standard basis vectors of $\mathbb{R}^n$, such that*

$$\|M\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \gg_{m,n} C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{v} \in V.$$

*Proof. Part (i).* First we prove the result on the assumption that $M^TM$ is diagonal. Let the sets $T_{k,\ell}$ and the matrices $L^{[k]}$ be as in Lemma 3.1. Since $M^TM$ is diagonal with diagonal entries $\Lambda_i^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in T_{k,n}} \Lambda_{a_1}^2 \cdots \Lambda_{a_k}^2 &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in T_{k,n}} (M^TM)^{[k]}_{\boldsymbol{aa}} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{a}\in T_{k,n}\\ \boldsymbol{w}\in T_{k,m}}} (M^{[k]}_{\boldsymbol{wa}})^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

by (3.1). The left-hand side of (3.5) is $\asymp_n \Lambda_1^2 \cdots \Lambda_k^2$, and the right-hand side is $\asymp_{m,n} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(k)}\|_\infty^2$, so this proves (3.2).

Let $O$ be an $n \times n$ orthogonal matrix such that $O^TM^TMO$ is diagonal. Let $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{(k)}$ be the vector of $k \times k$ minors of $MO$. We claim that the norms $\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{(k)}\|_\infty$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(k)}\|_\infty$ are of comparable size.

Lemma 3.1 shows that $(MO)^{[k]} = M^{[k]}O^{[k]}$, and since $(O^T)^{[k]}O^{[k]} = I^{[k]}$ and $(O^T)^{[k]}_{\alpha\beta} = O^{[k]}_{\beta\alpha}$ we see that $O^{[k]}$ is orthogonal. Hence the maximum norm of the entries satisfies

$$\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}^{(k)}\|_\infty = \|(MO)^{[k]}\|_\infty \asymp_{m,n} \|M^{[k]}\|_\infty = \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(k)}\|_\infty.$$

So in proving (3.2) we may assume that $M^TM$ is diagonal. The result follows.

*Part (ii).* By permuting the rows and columns of $M$, we may assume that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(k)}\|_\infty = |\det(M_{ij})_{1\le i,j\le k}|. \tag{3.6}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be in the span of the first $k$ basis vectors. If (3.3) holds for all such $\boldsymbol{v}$ then we have proved the lemma. Since $v_i = 0$ for $i > k$, one finds that

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc|c} M_{11} & \cdots & M_{1n} & \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \\ M_{k1} & \cdots & M_{kn} & \\ \hline 0_{(n-k)\times k} & & I_{n-k} & \end{array}\right)\left(\boldsymbol{v}\;\middle|\;\begin{array}{c} 0_{1\times(n-1)} \\ \hline I_{n-1}\end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{cccc} (M\boldsymbol{v})_1 & M_{12} & \cdots & M_{1n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (M\boldsymbol{v})_k & M_{k2} & \cdots & M_{kn} \\ \hline 0_{(n-k)\times k} & & I_{n-k} & \end{array}\right)$$

where we have divided each matrix into three blocks, and $0_{p\times q}$ stands for a $p \times q$ block of zeroes. By (3.6) we have $\pm v_1 \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(k)}\|_\infty$ as the determinant of the left-hand side. Expanding the determinant of the right-hand side in the first column, we find that it is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\pm\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(k)}\|_\infty v_1 &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k}(-1)^{\ell+1}(M\boldsymbol{v})_\ell \det\big(\big(M_{ij}\big)_{\substack{i=1,\dots,k;\, i\neq\ell \\ j=2,\dots,k}}\big) \\ &\ll k\|M\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(k-1)}\|_\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Note the $(k-1)\times(k-1)$ determinant in which $i$ runs over $1,\dots,k$ with the value $\ell$ omitted, and $j$ runs over $2,\dots,k$.

By part (i), this implies that $\Lambda_k v_1 \ll_{m,n} \|M\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty$, so provided that $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty = |v_1|$, then (3.3) holds.

If we apply the same permutation both to the $v_i$ and to the first $k$ rows of $M$, then both sides of our claim (3.3) and our assumption (3.6) remain the same. By applying such a permutation we may assume $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty = |v_1|$, and so we have proved (3.3).

*Part (iii).* Let $X$ be the span of the $\Lambda_i^2$-eigenvectors of $M^TM$, where $i$ runs from $k$ up to $n$. As the matrix $M^TM$ is symmetric, we have $\boldsymbol{X}^TM^TM\boldsymbol{X} \ll_n \|\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty^2\Lambda_k^2$ for all $\boldsymbol{X} \in X$, and so

$$\|M\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty \ll_{m,n} \|\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty\Lambda_k$$

for all $\boldsymbol{X} \in X$. Therefore either this space $X$ satisfies (3.4), or the bound $\Lambda_k \gg_{m,n} C^{-1}$ holds and the existence of the space $V$ follows by part (ii). □

# 4 Counting points in the sets $K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$

In this section our goal is to estimate the number of integer points in the sets $K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$ from Definition 2.1. We give the following result.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let $c$ and $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$ be as in Definition 1.1, let $\lambda_{c,i}(\boldsymbol{x})$, $\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,i)}(\boldsymbol{x})$, $J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,i)}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ be as in Definition 1.2, and let $K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$ be as in Definition 2.1. Suppose that $B, C \geq 1$, $\sigma \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}$, and $k \in \{0,\dots,n-\sigma-1\}$, and that $CB \geq E_1 \geq E_{k+1} \geq 1$. Then at least one of the following holds:*

*(I)$_k$ The set $K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$ may be covered by a collection of at most*

$$O_{C,n}(B^\sigma(E_1\cdots E_{k+1})E_{k+1}^{-\sigma-k-1})$$

*boxes in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of side $E_{k+1}$. Such a box contains $O_n(E_{k+1}^n)$ integral points, so it follows that*

$$\#\{\mathbb{Z}^n \cap K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})\} \ll_{C,n} B^\sigma(E_1\cdots E_{k+1})E_{k+1}^{n-\sigma-k-1}. \quad (4.1)$$

*(II)$_k$ There exist an integer $1 \leq b \leq k$, a point $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)} \in K_b(E_1,\cdots,E_{b+1})$, and a $(\sigma+b+1)$-dimensional linear subspace $X$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} E_{b+1} &< C^{-1}E_b, \\ \|J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty &\leq C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{X} \in X. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

*(III) There is a $(\sigma+1)$-dimensional linear subspace $X$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$\|H_c(\boldsymbol{X})\|_\infty \leq C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{X} \in X, \quad (4.3)$$

*with $\|H_c(\boldsymbol{X})\|_\infty$ as in §1.4.*

*We have subscripted the first two items to emphasize their dependence on $k$; note that item (III) has no such dependence.*

In Corollary 5.1 below, we will use Lemma 4.1 to bound the quantities (2.1) and (2.2) from Corollary 2.1. Before proving the lemma, we give a comparison with step (2) in §1.4.

If there are many integer points $\boldsymbol{x}$ for which $\operatorname{rank} H_c(\boldsymbol{x}) = b$ holds, then step (2) gives us a point $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}$ for which the matrix $J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$ has a kernel of dimension $(\sigma+b+1)$ or more and $\operatorname{rank} H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}) = b$ holds.

If there are many integer points $\boldsymbol{x}$ for which $\boldsymbol{x} \in K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$, then (4.1) is false and so either (II)$_k$ or (III) must hold. Of these, case (II)$_k$ gives us a point $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}$ such that $J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$ is small on a $(\sigma+b+1)$-dimensional space. Moreover it states that $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)} \in K_b(E_1,\cdots,E_{b+1})$ and that $E_{b+1} < C^{-1}E_b$, so that the $(b+1)$th eigenvalue of the matrix $H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$ is about $C$ times smaller than the $b$th eigenvalue. Thus (II)$_k$ gives us a point $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}$ for which in some sense $J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$ is close to having a kernel of dimension at least $(\sigma+b+1)$ and $H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$ is close to having rank $b$.

The third case (III) is less directly comparable to step (2). We suggest that it could correspond to the case $b = 0$ of step (2).

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* The proof is by induction on $k$. Let $c$, $C$, $B$, and $\sigma$ be fixed.

*The case $k = 0$.* Let $k = 0$, let $CB \geq E_1 \geq 1$ and suppose that alternative (III) does not hold. We claim that alternative $(\mathrm{I})_0$ holds, that is $K_0(E_1)$ is covered by $O_{C,n}(B^\sigma/E_1^\sigma)$ boxes of side $E_1$.

As $(\mathrm{III})_0$ is false, applying Lemma 3.2(ii) to the matrix of the linear map $\boldsymbol{x} \mapsto H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$ shows that there is an $(n-\sigma)$-dimensional subspace $V$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with

$$\|H_c(\boldsymbol{v})\|_\infty \gg_n C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{v} \in V. \tag{4.4}$$

For each $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $A_0(\boldsymbol{z})$ be the box in $\mathbb{R}^n$ defined by

$$A_0(\boldsymbol{z}) = \{\boldsymbol{z} + \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{v} : \boldsymbol{u} \in V^\perp, \boldsymbol{v} \in V, \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_\infty \leq E_1, \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \leq B\}.$$

Now $K_0(E_1)$ is contained in the box $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_\infty \leq B$. It follows that we can cover $K_0(E_1)$ with a collection of $O_{C,n}(B^\sigma/E_1^\sigma)$ boxes of the form $A_0(\boldsymbol{z})$, each one of which is centred at a point $\boldsymbol{z}$ belonging to $K_0(E_1)$. We will show below that for each $\boldsymbol{z} \in K_0(E_1)$, the intersection $A_0(\boldsymbol{z}) \cap K_0(E_1)$ is contained in a box of side $O_{C,n}(E_1)$. It follows that $K_0(E_1)$ is covered by $O_{C,n}(B^\sigma/E_1^\sigma)$ boxes of side $E_1$, as claimed.

It remains to let $\boldsymbol{z} \in K_0(E_1)$ and let $\boldsymbol{y} \in A_0(\boldsymbol{z}) \cap K_0(E_1)$, and to deduce that $\|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{z}\|_\infty \ll_{C,n} E_1$ must hold.

By definition of $K_0(E_1)$ we have $|\lambda_{c,1}(\boldsymbol{y})| \leq E_1$ and $|\lambda_{c,1}(\boldsymbol{z})| \leq E_1$, and the bounds $\|H_c(\boldsymbol{y})\|_\infty \ll_n E_1$ and $\|H_c(\boldsymbol{z})\|_\infty \ll_n E_1$ follow by (1.10). So we have

$$\|H_c(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{z})\|_\infty \ll_n E_1. \tag{4.5}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in V^\perp$ and let $\boldsymbol{v} \in V$ such that $\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{z} + \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{v}$ holds. Since $\boldsymbol{y}$ lies in $A_0(\boldsymbol{z})$, we have $\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_\infty \leq E_1$, and with (4.5) this implies that

$$\|H_c(\boldsymbol{v})\|_\infty \ll_n E_1.$$

By (4.4) it follows that $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \ll_n CE_1$, and hence that $\|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{z}\|_\infty \ll_{C,n} E_1$, as claimed.

*The inductive step.* Let $k \geq 1$ and let $CB \geq E_1 \geq \cdots E_{k+1} \geq 1$. We suppose that $(\mathrm{II})_k$ and (III) are both false, and claim that $(\mathrm{I})_k$ holds.

By induction, at least one of $(\mathrm{I})_{k-1}$, $(\mathrm{II})_{k-1}$, or (III) holds. Note that of these (III) is false by assumption, and $(\mathrm{II})_{k-1}$ is false since it implies $(\mathrm{II})_k$, and so $(\mathrm{I})_{k-1}$ must hold.

Suppose for the time being that

$$E_{k+1} < C^{-1}E_k. \tag{4.6}$$

The contrary case is almost trivial and will be dealt with at the end of the proof. We claim that

$$K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1}) = \bigcup_V K_k^{(C,V)}(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1}), \tag{4.7}$$

where $V$ runs over those $(n-\sigma-k)$-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^n$ which are spanned by standard basis vectors, and we define

$$\begin{aligned} &K_k^{(C,V)}(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1}) = \\ &\big\{\boldsymbol{x} \in K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1}) : \|J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \geq C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k)}(\boldsymbol{x})\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{v} \in V\big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

We have assumed that $E_{k+1} < C^{-1}E_k$ and that the case $b = k$ of $(\mathrm{II})_k$ is false. So the case $b = k$ of (4.2) must be false for every $(\sigma+b+1)$-dimensional subspace $X$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and every $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)} \in K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$.

That is, for any $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)} \in K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$ and any $(\sigma+k+1)$-dimensional linear subspace $X$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$, there is some $\boldsymbol{X} \in X$ such that

$$\|J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty > C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty.$$

Applying Lemma 3.2(ii) with the choice $M = J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$ shows that for each $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)} \in K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$ there is an $(n-\sigma-k)$-dimensional subspace $V$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$, spanned by standard basis vectors, such that

$$\|J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \geq C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \tag{4.9}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{v} \in V$. This proves (4.7), and so to prove $(\mathrm{I})_k$ it now suffices to show that for each $(n-\sigma-k)$-dimensional space $V$, the set (4.8) is covered by a union of $O_{C,n}(B^\sigma(E_1\cdots E_{k+1})E_{k+1}^{-\sigma-k-1})$ boxes of side $E_{k+1}$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a sufficiently small constant depending at most on $C$ and $n$, and for each $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ set

$$A_k(\boldsymbol{z}) = \{\boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{v} : \boldsymbol{u} \in V^\perp, \boldsymbol{v} \in V, \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_\infty \leq E_{k+1}, \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon E_k\}. \tag{4.10}$$

We assumed at the start of this inductive step that $(\mathrm{I})_{k-1}$ holds, and so $K_{k-1}(E_1,\dots,E_k)$ is covered by a collection of $O_{C,n}(B^\sigma(E_1\cdots E_k)E_k^{-\sigma-k})$ boxes of side $E_k$. Subdivide each of these boxes into $O_{C,n}(E_k^{\sigma+k}/E_{k+1}^{\sigma+k})$ sub-boxes of the form $A_k(\boldsymbol{z})$. Since

$$K_k^{(C,V)}(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1}) \subset K_{k-1}(E_1,\dots,E_k),$$

it follows that the set $K_k^{(C,V)}(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$ may be covered by a collection of $O_{C,n}(B^\sigma(E_1\cdots E_{k+1})E_{k+1}^{-\sigma-k-1})$ boxes of the form $A_k(\boldsymbol{z})$, each of which is centred at a point $\boldsymbol{z}$ belonging to the set $K_k^{(C,V)}(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$.

We will show below that for each such box $A_k(\boldsymbol{z})$, the intersection $A_k(\boldsymbol{z}) \cap K_k^{(C,V)}(E_1, \dots, E_{k+1})$ is covered by a box of side $O_{C,n}(E_{k+1})$. It follows that each set (4.8) is covered by $O_{C,n}(B^\sigma(E_1 \cdots E_{k+1})E_{k+1}^{-\sigma-k-1})$ boxes of side $E_{k+1}$, and by the comments after (4.9) this proves the lemma.

We suppose that $\boldsymbol{z} \in K_k^{(C,V)}(E_1, \dots, E_{k+1})$ and that $\boldsymbol{y} \in A_k(\boldsymbol{z}) \cap K_k^{(C,V)}(E_1, \dots, E_{k+1})$, and we claim that $\|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{z}\|_\infty \ll_{C,n} E_{k+1}$ holds. Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in V^\perp$ and let $\boldsymbol{v} \in V$ such that $\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{z} + \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{v}$, and note that since $\boldsymbol{y} \in A_k(\boldsymbol{z})$, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_\infty \le E_{k+1}, \qquad \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \le \epsilon E_k. \tag{4.11}$$

Now the $j$th partial derivatives of the $(k+1)\times(k+1)$ minors $\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are linear combinations of the $(k+1-j)\times(k+1-j)$ minors $\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1-j)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ with coefficients of size at most $O_n(1)$. So we have

$$\Big\| \frac{\partial^j \boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial x_{i_1} \cdots \partial x_{i_j}} \Big\|_\infty \ll_n \|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1-j)}(\boldsymbol{x})\|_\infty,$$

and Taylor expansion shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}(\boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{v}) - \boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}(\boldsymbol{z}) \\
&\qquad = J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}}(\boldsymbol{z}).(\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{v}) + O_n\Big(\|\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty^2 \|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k-1)}(\boldsymbol{z})\|_\infty\Big) \\
&\qquad\qquad + \cdots + O_n\Big(\|\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty^k \|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,1)}(\boldsymbol{z})\|_\infty + \|\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty^{k+1}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}}(\boldsymbol{z})\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty &\ll_n \|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}(\boldsymbol{y})\|_\infty + \|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}(\boldsymbol{z})\|_\infty \\
&\quad + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k)}(\boldsymbol{z})\|_\infty + \cdots + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_\infty^k \|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,1)}(\boldsymbol{z})\|_\infty + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_\infty^{k+1} \\
&\quad + \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty^2 \|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k-1)}(\boldsymbol{z})\|_\infty + \cdots + \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty^k \|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,1)}(\boldsymbol{z})\|_\infty + \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty^{k+1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{z} \in K_k(E_1, \dots, E_{k+1})$, Lemma 3.2 gives us the bounds

$$\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,j)}(\boldsymbol{z})\|_\infty \asymp_n \prod_{i=1}^{j} E_i, \qquad \|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}(\boldsymbol{y})\|_\infty \asymp_n \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} E_i, \tag{4.13}$$

and since $\boldsymbol{z} \in K_k^{(C,V)}(E_1, \dots, E_{k+1})$ it follows from (4.8) that

$$\|J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k+1)}}(\boldsymbol{z})\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \gg_n C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \prod_{i=1}^{k} E_i. \tag{4.14}$$

Substituting (4.13)-(4.14) into (4.12) yields

$$C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \ll_n \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} E_i + \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty^2 \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} E_i + \cdots + \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty^k E_1 + \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty^{k+1}$$
$$+ \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_\infty \prod_{i=1}^{k} E_i + \cdots + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_\infty^k E_1 + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_\infty^{k+1}.$$

Applying the bounds from (4.11) and the inequalities $E_1 \geq \cdots \geq E_{k+1}$, we deduce that

$$C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \ll_n \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} E_i + \epsilon\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \prod_{i=1}^{k} E_i.$$

Since $\epsilon$ is assumed to be small in terms of $C$ and $n$, it follows that $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \ll_n CE_{k+1}$ holds and hence that $\|\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{z}\|_\infty \ll_{C,n} E_{k+1}$ holds. By the comments after (4.10), this proves the lemma.

It remains to consider the case when (4.6) is false and so $E_{k+1} \geq C^{-1}E_k$ holds. At the start of the inductive step we supposed that $(\mathrm{I})_{k-1}$ holds, so the set $K_{k-1}(E_1,\ldots,E_k)$ may be covered by $O_{C,n}(B^\sigma(E_1\cdots E_k)E_k^{-\sigma-k})$ boxes of side $E_k$. We have

$$K_k(E_1,\ldots,E_{k+1}) \subset K_{k-1}(E_1,\ldots,E_k),$$

and so the set $K_k(E_1,\ldots,E_{k+1})$ is also covered by this collection of boxes. Since $E_{k+1} \geq C^{-1}E_k$ holds, we can divide each of these boxes into $O_{C,n}(1)$ boxes of side $E_{k+1}$. This proves $(\mathrm{I})_k$. □

# 5 Small values of a trilinear form

Part (3) of Davenport's argument from §1.4 starts from a point $\boldsymbol{x}$ for which the matrices $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ have prescribed ranks, and finds linear spaces $X, Y$ such that for all $\boldsymbol{X} \in X$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{Y'} \in Y$ the equation $\boldsymbol{Y}^T H_c(\boldsymbol{X})\boldsymbol{Y'} = 0$ holds. Our analogue is the following pair of results, which give linear spaces on which the trilinear form $\boldsymbol{Y}^T H_c(\boldsymbol{X})\boldsymbol{Y'}$ is small.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let $c(\boldsymbol{x})$ be as in Definition 1.1, and let $\lambda_{c,i}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,i)}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ be as in Definition 1.2. Suppose that $b \in \{1,\ldots,n-1\}$ and that $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, provided $\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$ is nonzero, there exists an $(n-b)$-dimensional linear subspace $Y$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that for all $\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{Y'} \in Y$ and all $\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have*

$$\boldsymbol{Y}^T H_c(\boldsymbol{t})\boldsymbol{Y'} \ll_n \left( \frac{\|J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\boldsymbol{t}\|_\infty}{\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\|_\infty} + \frac{|\lambda_{c,b+1}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})| \cdot \|\boldsymbol{t}\|_\infty}{|\lambda_{c,b}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})|} \right) \|\boldsymbol{Y}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{Y'}\|_\infty. \tag{5.1}$$

By setting $b = \operatorname{rank} H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$ and $X = \ker J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$, one may recover Davenport's result. We prove Lemma 5.1 at the end of this section, after deducing

**Corollary 5.1.** *Let $c$, $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)$ be as in Definition 1.1. For any $B, C \geq 1$ and any $\sigma \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, one of the following alternatives holds. Either*

$$N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B) \ll_{C,n} B^{n+\sigma}(\log B)^n, \tag{5.2}$$

*or there exist positive-dimensional linear subspaces $X$ and $Y$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ for which $\dim X + \dim Y = n + \sigma + 1$, such that*

$$|\boldsymbol{Y}^T H_c(\boldsymbol{X})\boldsymbol{Y}'| \ll_n C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{Y}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{Y}'\|_\infty \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{X} \in X,\ \boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{Y}' \in Y. \tag{5.3}$$

*Proof.* We saw in Lemma 4.1 that for any $k \in \{0, \dots, n-\sigma-1\}$ and any $E_1, \dots, E_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$CB \geq E_1 \geq \cdots \geq E_{k+1} \geq 1,$$

one of $(\mathrm{I})_k$, $(\mathrm{II})_k$, or $(\mathrm{III})$ must hold. Suppose first that in every case alternative $(\mathrm{I})_k$ holds. By (4.1), we then have

$$\#\{\mathbb{Z}^n \cap K_k(E_1, \dots, E_{k+1})\} \ll_{C,n} B^\sigma (E_1 \cdots E_{k+1}) E_{k+1}^{n-\sigma-k-1} \tag{5.4}$$

for every $k \in \{0, \dots, n-\sigma-1\}$ and every $CB \geq E_1 \geq \cdots \geq E_{k+1} \geq 1$. Now Corollary 2.1 shows that either

$$\frac{N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)}{B^n(\log B)^n} \ll_n \#\{\mathbb{Z}^n \cap K_0(1)\}, \tag{5.5}$$

or

$$\frac{2^{e_1+\cdots+e_k} N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)}{B^n(\log B)^n} \ll_n \#\big\{\mathbb{Z}^n \cap K_k(2^{e_1}, \dots, 2^{e_k}, 1)\big\}, \tag{5.6}$$

where $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and the inequalities $B \gg_n 2^{e_1} \geq \cdots \geq 2^{e_{k+1}} \geq 1$ hold, or

$$\frac{2^{e_1+\cdots+e_n} N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)}{B^n(\log B)^n} \ll_n \#\big\{\mathbb{Z}^n \cap K_{n-1}(2^{e_1}, \dots, 2^{e_n})\big\} \tag{5.7}$$

where the inequalities $B \gg_n 2^{e_1} \geq \cdots \geq 2^{e_n} \geq 1$ hold. We may assume that $C$ is sufficiently large in terms of $n$, so that $CB \geq 2^{e_1}$ holds in (5.6)-(5.7). Substituting the bound (5.4) into each of (5.5)-(5.7) proves the conclusion (5.2).

Suppose next that alternative (III) holds in Lemma 4.1. In this case we let $Y = \mathbb{R}^n$, and the conclusion (5.3) follows from (4.3).

It remains to treat the case when there exist $k \in \{0, \dots, n-\sigma-1\}$ and $CB \geq E_1 \geq \cdots \geq E_{k+1} \geq 1$ such that alternative $(\mathrm{II})_k$ holds in Lemma 4.1. This means that there exist an integer $1 \leq b \leq k$, a point $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)} \in K_b(E_1, \cdots, E_{b+1})$, and a $(\sigma+b+1)$-dimensional linear subspace $X$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$E_{b+1} < C^{-1} E_b, \tag{5.8}$$

and

$$\|J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty \le C^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{X}\in X. \quad (5.9)$$

Since $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)} \in K_k(E_1,\dots,E_{k+1})$, the inequalities $\frac{1}{2}E_i < \lambda_{c,i}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}) \le E_i$ hold. Therefore (5.8) implies

$$\lambda_{c,b+1}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}) < 2C^{-1}\lambda_{c,b}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}), \quad (5.10)$$

Note that (5.10) implies that $\lambda_{c,b}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$ is nonzero, and so $\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$ is nonzero, by Lemma 3.2. Hence we may apply Lemma 5.1 to find an $(n-b)$-dimensional linear space $Y$ such that for all $\boldsymbol{Y},\boldsymbol{Y}'\in Y$ and all $\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{R}^n$ the bound (5.1) holds. The conclusion (5.3) follows on taking $\boldsymbol{t}=\boldsymbol{X}$ in (5.1) of Lemma 5.1 and substituting in the bounds (5.9) and (5.10). □

*Proof of Lemma 5.1.* We imitate the proof of Lemma 3 in Davenport [12], which begins by considering the following easy "warm-up" problem. Suppose we were to look for $n-b$ linearly independent vectors $\boldsymbol{y}$ at which $H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\boldsymbol{y}$ vanishes. One approach would be as follows. One can construct matrices $L^{(i)}$, $M^{(i)}$ for $i=1,\dots,n-b$, with entries in $\{0,\pm1\}$, such that the vectors

$$\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x}) = L^{(i)}\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}) \quad (5.11)$$

satisfy

$$H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x}) = M^{(i)}\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}(\boldsymbol{x}). \quad (5.12)$$

That is, the components of $\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are polynomials of the form $\pm\Delta_j^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{x})$, and the components of $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are polynomials of the form $\pm\Delta_j^{(b+1)}(\boldsymbol{x})$.

If $H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\boldsymbol{y}=\boldsymbol{0}$ had exactly $n-b$ linearly independent solutions $\boldsymbol{y}$, we would have $\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})=\boldsymbol{0}$, while $\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$ would be nonzero. We would then have $n-b$ solutions $\boldsymbol{Y}^{(k)}$ defined by

$$\boldsymbol{Y}^{(k)} = \frac{\boldsymbol{y}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})}{\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\|_\infty} \qquad (1\le k\le n-b), \quad (5.13)$$

and if we chose our matrices $L^{(i)}, M^{(i)}$ appropriately these would be linearly independent.

We now return to the proof of the lemma. Assume for the time being that $L^{(i)}$, $M^{(i)}$, $\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}^{(i)}$ satisfying (5.11)-(5.13) are given, and let $\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)}$ be as in the lemma. Let $\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\partial_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ be the directional derivative along $\boldsymbol{t}$ defined by $\sum t_i\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$, and apply $\partial_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ to both sides of (5.12). This shows that

$$\big[\partial_{\boldsymbol{t}}H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\big]\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x}) + H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\big[\partial_{\boldsymbol{t}}\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x})\big] = M^{(i)}\big[\partial_{\boldsymbol{t}}\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}(\boldsymbol{x})\big]. \quad (5.14)$$

Since $\partial_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ is a linear operator and we have

$$\partial_{\boldsymbol{t}} \boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k)}(\boldsymbol{x}) = J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,k)}}(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{t},$$

it follows from (5.14) that

$$H_c(\boldsymbol{t})\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x}) = M^{(i)} J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{t} - H_c(\boldsymbol{x}) L^{(i)} \partial_{\boldsymbol{t}} \boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

Premultiplying by $\boldsymbol{y}^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{x})^T$ and using (5.12) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{y}^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{x})^T H_c(\boldsymbol{t})\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{y}^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{x})^T M^{(i)} J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{t} \\ - \big[M^{(i)}\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}(\boldsymbol{x})\big]^T \big[L^{(i)}\partial_{\boldsymbol{t}}\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x})\big]. \quad (5.15)\end{aligned}$$

Now Lemma 3.2 shows that

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}(\boldsymbol{x})\|_\infty}{\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x})\|_\infty} \ll_n |\lambda_{c,b+1}(\boldsymbol{x})|, \qquad \frac{\|\partial_{\boldsymbol{t}}\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x})\|_\infty}{\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x})\|_\infty} \ll_n \frac{\|\boldsymbol{t}\|_\infty}{|\lambda_{c,b}(\boldsymbol{x})|}$$

and substituting these bounds into (5.15) gives

$$\boldsymbol{Y}^{(j)T} H_c(\boldsymbol{t})\boldsymbol{Y}^{(i)} \ll_n \frac{\|J_{\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b+1)}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\boldsymbol{t}\|_\infty}{\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\|_\infty} + \frac{|\lambda_{c,b+1}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})| \cdot \|\boldsymbol{t}\|_\infty}{|\lambda_{c,b}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})|} \quad (5.16)$$

where the $\boldsymbol{Y}^{(k)}$ are as in (5.13).

The idea is now to let $Y$ be the span of the $\boldsymbol{Y}^{(k)}$ and deduce (5.1) from (5.16). Since we are looking for an $(n-b)$-dimensional space $Y$ we will need $\boldsymbol{Y}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{Y}^{(n-b)}$ to be linearly independent. In order to prove (5.1) we require the following slightly stronger statement. We claim there are $L^{(i)}$, $M^{(i)}$, $\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}^{(i)}$ satisfying (5.11)-(5.13), such that the linear combination defined by $\boldsymbol{Y} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-b} \gamma_i \boldsymbol{Y}^{(i)}$ satisfies $\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_\infty \ll_n \|\boldsymbol{Y}\|_\infty$ for every vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ in real $(n-b)$-space. The lemma then follows, with $Y$ being the span of the $\boldsymbol{Y}^{(i)}$, on expressing $\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{Y}'$ as linear combinations of the $\boldsymbol{Y}^{(i)}$ and applying (5.16).

For the remainder of the proof we will assume for simplicity that the $b \times b$ minor of $H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})$ with largest absolute value is the minor in the lower right-hand corner, that is, we will assume that

$$\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\|_\infty = \big|\det\big((H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})_{k\ell})_{\substack{k=n-b+1,\dots,n \\ \ell=n-b+1,\dots,n}}\big)\big|. \quad (5.17)$$

In general (5.17) holds after permuting the rows and columns of the matrix $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$ and one can then apply the same permutations throughout the rest of our construction of $\boldsymbol{Y}^{(i)}$, every time the matrix $H_c(\boldsymbol{x})$ appears.

Define $\boldsymbol{y}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{x}), \dots, \boldsymbol{y}^{(n-b)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ by

$$y_j^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{n-b} \det\big((H_c(\boldsymbol{x})_{k\ell})_{\substack{k=n-b+1,\dots,n \\ \ell=n-b+1,\dots,n}}\big) & \text{if } j = i, \\ (-1)^j \det\big((H_c(\boldsymbol{x})_{k\ell})_{\substack{k=n-b+1,\dots,n \\ \ell=i,n-b+1,\dots,n;\ \ell\neq j}}\big) & \text{if } j > n-b, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $(\ell = i, n-b+1, \dots, n;\ \ell \neq j)$ means that $\ell$ first takes the value $i$ and then runs over the numbers $n-b+1, \dots, n$ with $j$ omitted. Now this is of the form (5.11), and one can check that

$$(H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x}))_j = \begin{cases} (-1)^{n-b} \det\big((H_c(\boldsymbol{x})_{k\ell})_{\substack{k=j,n-b+1,\dots,n \\ \ell=i,n-b+1,\dots,n}}\big) & \text{if } j \leq n-b \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

which is of the form (5.12). Define a matrix $Q$ by

$$Q = \big(\boldsymbol{Y}^{(1)} \,\big|\, \cdots \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{Y}^{(n-b)} \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{e}^{(n-b+1)} \,\big|\, \cdots \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{e}^{(n)}\big),$$

or equivalently by

$$Q = \Big(\tfrac{\boldsymbol{y}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})}{\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\|_\infty} \,\Big|\, \cdots \,\Big|\, \tfrac{\boldsymbol{y}^{(n-b)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})}{\|\boldsymbol{D}^{(c,b)}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(0)})\|_\infty} \,\Big|\, \boldsymbol{e}^{(n-b+1)} \,\Big|\, \cdots \,\Big|\, \boldsymbol{e}^{(n)}\Big),$$

so that the entries $Q_{ij}$ have absolute value at most 1. Then one sees from (5.17) that

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} I_{n-b} & 0_{b\times b} \\ \widetilde{Q} & I_b \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\widetilde{Q}$ is some $(n-b)\times(n-b)$ matrix. In particular $\det Q = 1$, and so the entries of $Q^{-1}$ are bounded in terms of $n$. It follows that if $\boldsymbol{Y} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-b} \gamma_i \boldsymbol{Y}^{(i)}$ then $\gamma_i = (Q^{-1}\boldsymbol{Y})_i \ll_n \|\boldsymbol{Y}\|_\infty$, as claimed. □

# 6 Constructing singular points on $V(c)$

Corollary 5.1 shows that either $N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B)$ is small, or there are spaces $X, Y$ of large dimension on which $\boldsymbol{Y}^T H_c(\boldsymbol{X})\boldsymbol{Y}'$ is small. To prove Proposition 1.1 we show that the second alternative implies that $V(c)$ is singular. This is our analogue of Davenport's step (4), as described in §1.4.

*Proof of Proposition 1.1.* Suppose for a contradiction that the result is false. Then for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $c_N \in \mathcal{K}$ with

$$N_c^{\mathrm{aux}}(B) \geq N B^{n+\sigma_{\mathcal{K}}} (\log B)^n.$$

By Corollary 5.1, this implies that there are linear subspaces $X_N, Y_N$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\dim X_N + \dim Y_N = n + \sigma_{\mathcal{K}} + 1$$

holds and for all $\boldsymbol{X} \in X_N$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{Y}' \in Y_N$, we have

$$|\boldsymbol{Y}^T H_{c_N}(\boldsymbol{X})\boldsymbol{Y}'| \leq N^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{Y}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{X}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{Y}'\|_\infty.$$

If we multiply $c_N$ by a constant then the matrix $H_{c_N}(\boldsymbol{x})$ does not change. So we may assume that for each $N$ the equality $\|c_N\|_\infty = 1$ holds. After

passing to a subsequence we have $c_N \to c$ as $N \to \infty$, and it follows that there are subspaces $X, Y$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\dim X + \dim Y = n + \sigma_{\mathcal{K}} + 1$ and

$$\boldsymbol{Y}^T H_c(\boldsymbol{X})\boldsymbol{Y}' = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{X} \in X,\ \boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{Y}' \in Y. \tag{6.1}$$

Let $b \in \{0, \dots, n - \sigma - 1\}$ such that

$$\dim X = n - b, \qquad \dim Y = \sigma_{\mathcal{K}} + b + 1.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}^{(n)}$ be a basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\boldsymbol{x}^{(b+1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}^{(n)}$ is a basis of $X$.

Let $[Y]$ be the projective linear space in $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}_{\mathbb{R}}$ associated to $Y$. Take homogeneous co-ordinates $\boldsymbol{y}$ on $[Y]$, so that $\boldsymbol{y}$ takes values in $Y$.

Let $W$ be the projective variety cut out in $[Y]$ by the $b$ equations

$$W : \boldsymbol{y}^T H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)})\boldsymbol{y} = 0 \qquad (i = 1, \dots, b), \tag{6.2}$$

so that

$$\dim W \geq \dim[Y] - b = \sigma_{\mathcal{K}}.$$

We claim that $W$ is contained in the singular locus of the projective hypersurface $V(c)$. It follows that $\dim \operatorname{Sing} V(c) \geq \sigma_{\mathcal{K}}$, which is a contradiction, by (1.6).

Now (6.1) implies that for every $\boldsymbol{y} \in Y$ we have

$$\boldsymbol{y}^T H_c(\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)})\boldsymbol{y} = 0 \qquad (i = b+1, \dots, n).$$

So if we let $\boldsymbol{y} \in Y$ such that (6.2) holds, then we have

$$\boldsymbol{y}^T H_c(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{y} = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

This implies that $\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{y}} c(\boldsymbol{y}) = \boldsymbol{0}$ holds, by the definition (1.4). It follows that every point of $W$ is contained in $\operatorname{Sing} V(c)$, as claimed. □

# 7 Acknowledgements

This work is based on a DPhil thesis submitted to Oxford University, and was supported by EPSRC grants EP/J500495/1 and EP/M507970/1. I would like to thank my DPhil supervisor, Roger Heath-Brown. I am grateful to Rainer Dietmann for helpful conversations.

# References

[1] R. C. Baker. Diagonal cubic equations. II. *Acta Arith.*, 53(3):217–250, 1989.

[2] B. J. Birch. Forms in many variables. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Ser. A*, 265:245–263, 1961/1962.

[3] T. D. Browning. A survey of applications of the circle method to rational points. In *Arithmetic and geometry*, volume 420 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 89–113. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2015.

[4] T. D. Browning and D. R. Heath-Brown. Forms in many variables and differing degrees. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*. (in press).

[5] J. Brüdern and T. D. Wooley. Hua's lemma and simultaneous diagonal equations. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 34(3):279–283, 2002.

[6] J. Brüdern and T. D. Wooley. Asymptotic formulae for pairs of diagonal equations. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 137(1):227–235, 2004.

[7] J. Brüdern and T. D. Wooley. The density of integral solutions for pairs of diagonal cubic equations. In *Analytic number theory*, volume 7 of *Clay Math. Proc.*, pages 57–76. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.

[8] J. Brüdern and T. D. Wooley. The Hasse principle for pairs of diagonal cubic forms. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 166(3):865–895, 2007.

[9] J. Brüdern and T. D. Wooley. Asymptotic formulae for pairs of diagonal cubic equations. *Canad. J. Math.*, 63(1):38–54, 2011.

[10] J. Brüdern and T. D. Wooley. Subconvexity for additive equations: pairs of undenary cubic forms. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 696:31–67, 2014.

[11] J. Brüdern and T. D. Wooley. The Hasse principle for systems of diagonal cubic forms. *Math. Ann.*, 364(3-4):1255–1274, 2016.

[12] H. Davenport. Cubic forms in sixteen variables. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Ser. A*, 272:285–303, 1963.

[13] R. Dietmann. On the h-invariant of cubic forms, and systems of cubic forms. *Q. J. Math.* (in press).

[14] R. Dietmann and T. D. Wooley. Pairs of cubic forms in many variables. *Acta Arith.*, 110(2):125–140, 2003.

[15] D. R. Heath-Brown. Cubic forms in 14 variables. *Invent. Math.*, 170(1):199–230, 2007.

[16] C. Hooley. On octonary cubic forms: II. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 47(1):85–94, 2015.

[17] S. L. Rydin Myerson. Quadratic forms and systems of forms in many variables. 2017. Submitted to Invent. Math. arXiv:1512.06003.

[18] W. M. Schmidt. On cubic polynomials. IV. Systems of rational equations. *Monatsh. Math.*, 93(4):329–348, 1982.